

Application No. 10/783,386
Response to Office Action dated August 10, 2006
Paper dated December 5, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 4262-031384

**Response Under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 1752**

REMARKS

This is in response to the final Office Action dated August 10, 2006. The undersigned wishes to thank Examiner Walke for the courtesies extended to Larry Rhodes and Bernie Berman, Esq. on October 23, 2006 in connection with this Office Action. Claims 1, 12-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a).

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Willson et al. and claims 12-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Willson et al. in view of Feiring et al. (Publication No. 2004/0265738) and/or U.S. Patent No. 6,908,724 to Araki et al.

Claims 2-11, 19 and 21-43 stand withdrawn.

In view of the interview and the enclosed 37 CFR § 1.132 Declaration of Larry F. Rhodes, a joint inventor, and the following remarks, applicants traverse the rejection. Further, claims 2-11, 19 and 21-43 have been cancelled.

Pursuant to the Examiner's request, Mr. Rhodes' presentation at the interview has been summarized and highlighted in his declaration. The following highlight the significant points of Mr. Rhodes' declaration. Claims 1, 12-18 and 20 are directed to oligomers, not polymers. Oligomers have a molecular weight substantially less than that of polymers. Willson et al. and Feiring et al. disclose polymers, not oligomers (see paragraphs 9, 10, A and C of the Rhodes declaration).

Polymer molecules are substantially heavier than oligomer molecules (see Exhibit B of the Rhodes declaration). The claims of the present invention are directed to dissolution rate

Application No. 10/783,386
Response to Office Action dated August 10, 2006
Paper dated December 5, 2006
Attorney Docket No. 4262-031384

Response Under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 1752


modifiers, not a photoresist binder resin or composition (see paragraphs 10, A and B of the Rhodes declaration).

For the reasons set forth in the Rhodes declaration and hereinabove and was clearly explained to the Examiner during the interview, it would not be obvious to replace the polymers of the Willson et al. and Feiring et al. references with oligomers for a dissolution rate modifier. The remaining cited prior art of record does not overcome the deficiencies of the Willson et al. and Feiring et al. references.

For the reasons set forth above, claims 1, 12-18 and 20 are patentable over the prior art of record. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

by 

Paul M. Reznick
Registration No. 33,059
Attorney for Applicants
700 Koppers Building
436 Seventh Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219
Telephone: 412-471-8815
Facsimile: 412-471-4094
E-mail: Webblaw@webblaw.com